

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



Reserve  
A 281.9  
SL 18

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
Office of the Secretary  
Washington 25, D. C.

January 9, 1963

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

NOV 9 1967

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

C  
O  
P  
Y

The President of the Senate  
United States Senate

The Speaker  
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. President:

Dear Mr. Speaker:

1961/62

Pursuant to the Act of June 28, 1937 of the 75th Congress (50 Stat. 329), there is submitted herewith the report of operations, expenditures and obligations under Sections 7 to 14 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the 1962 fiscal year Appropriation Act (75 Stat. 225).

A report is also included of the emergency conservation measures, needed to restore to productive use land damaged by natural disasters, which were authorized by Public Law 85-58 of June 21, 1957 (71 Stat. 176), Public Law 85-170 of August 28, 1957 (71 Stat. 426), Public Law 85-766 of August 27, 1958 (72 Stat. 864), and Public Law 87-332 of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 733).

Sincerely yours,

/s/ John P. Duncan, Jr.  
Assistant Secretary

Attachment



### AUTHORIZATION

Basic legislation authorizing the Agricultural Conservation Program is the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, sections 7 to 15, 16(a) and 17. Funds to finance the program are included in the annual Appropriation Act covering programs and activities of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Section 9 of the Act authorizing the program, as amended by the Act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 329), requires that the Secretary of Agriculture shall transmit to the Congress a report for each fiscal year on the operations, expenditures, and obligations under sections 7 to 14.

### BACKGROUND

The Agricultural Conservation Program is a program under which the Government each year shares with more than a million farmers and ranchers the cost of soil, water, woodland, and wildlife conservation practices on individual farms and ranches throughout the Nation. Originally, the Agricultural Conservation Program offered assistance payments to farmers for production and land-use adjustments in addition to conservation measures. Beginning in 1944, however, ACP assistance has been limited to soil-building and soil- and water-conserving measures which farmers normally would not carry out to the extent necessary if they had to bear the whole cost. Since 1954, the regular program has been operated at an annual authorized level of \$250 million.

### NATIONAL CONSERVATION ACTION IS A NECESSITY

Early in 1962 a policy guide for land and water resources was developed by the Department of Agriculture. A part of this report contains an estimate of the costs, including total private and public investments, which would be incurred if the conservation problems inventoried in the Department's recent conservation needs inventory are to be met. The report indicates that approximately \$50 billion would be required to meet such problems, and if the treatments necessary were to be applied over a 20-year period, an average annual conservation expenditure of \$2.5 billion would be required. This would equal nearly 10 percent of present annual farm operating costs or about 20 percent of the current net income from farming. At present, only 4 percent to 6 percent of net farm income is being invested in conservation measures, with over 60 percent of them accompanied by Federal cost-sharing. The current annual conservation investment from all sources is estimated at about \$750 million of which about 30 percent is Federal and 70 percent non-Federal. The report continues by pointing out that unless a greater portion of farm income than at present can be channeled into conservation investment, a billion-dollar increase in net farm income would yield at most a \$60-million increase in conservation investment. The report concludes that increased income alone cannot be relied upon to achieve an annual investment in conservation comparable to what is estimated to be needed.



Only about one-third of the volume of conservation work needed is currently being applied, even with all of the public assistance and efforts that are currently going into this activity. If the public's interest in maintaining its basic soil, water, forest and wildlife resources is to be met, a great deal of public assistance will be necessary.

Land which must be currently used for crops constitutes the vast majority of the soil, water and forest resource on which we will continue to depend for food and other agricultural products for an expanding population. It is most important that we protect and conserve this land while it is being used. The Agricultural Conservation Program is the principal means by which the public invests funds to assure that owners of this land will protect and conserve it. Past experience indicates that farmers will not bear the total expense of applying conservation measures. Without public cost-sharing our agricultural resource will deteriorate.

#### Conservation Costs Before It Pays

Most farming practices that conserve agricultural soil and water resources are expensive. They require an initial outlay of capital. Many result in at least a temporary reduction in crop yields. Some increase the expenditure for farming operations. Recent studies have revealed some of the reasons why farmers are reluctant to adopt conservation systems of farming, even though they recognize that such a system may eventually result in increased farm income. In addition to the substantial initial investment, there is usually a loss of immediate income when a conservation system of farming is adopted. Returns which can be expected from some types of needed conservation measures (for example, terrace systems, erosion control structures and certain forestry improvement and wildlife conservation measures) will not equal their cost for a long time.

#### Farmers and the Public Jointly Invest and Jointly Benefit

Because of their inseparable interest and mutual interdependence, farmers and other citizens generally recognize the necessity of jointly bringing their resources to bear on problems in the field of soil, water, and woodland conservation. Federal and State governments have sought and continue to seek the best methods of expressing this essential partnership. Research and experimental work have developed and are developing means by which soil and water resources can be conserved. Educational work is teaching the value of and need for conservation effort. Technical services determine the conservation measures that are needed and furnish engineering and other professional assistance to correctly install them. The remaining barrier then is cost. Federal cost-sharing by the Agricultural Conservation Program helps overcome that remaining barrier. The Agricultural Conservation Program is the means by which all the people bear a part of the costs of conservation measures that would not otherwise be carried out sufficiently to meet the public interest. The Agricultural Conservation Program among with the other conservation facilities, helps insure continued abundant production at bargain prices, for all the people of the country.

### LOCAL PEOPLE DEVELOP THEIR OWN PROGRAM

The development of the Agricultural Conservation Program begins at the farm level in order to meet the conservation needs of the land. The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation county committee with the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, and other local groups interested in conservation, including soil and water conservation district governing bodies, formulates a program for the land and water resources of each county. These recommendations are the basis for each State's recommendations for the national program. From State recommendations, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Economic Research Service, the Office of Rural Areas Development, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Forest Service, develop and recommend to the Secretary annually a national program for the ensuing year.

#### Local People Administer Their Program

The Agricultural Conservation Program, as applied to each farm, is administered by ASC county committees of resident farmers elected by the farmers they serve. These county committees are supervised by ASC State committees of resident farmers appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The local county agent is ex officio a member of the county committee and the State Director of Extension holds a like position on the State committee.

State, county and community committeemen work directly with farmers to get the greatest volume of conservation performed on the land by the farmers with the funds available to the county. The Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service provide on-farm technical services to the farmer to assure sound accomplishments through the Agricultural Conservation Program.

### THE 1961 PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHED MUCH CONSERVATION

The 1961 Agricultural Conservation Program served the largest number of participants and made the fullest utilization of available funds, of any program in recent years. It was used on 1,216,556 farms comprising 433 million acres of farmland. 85 percent of the practice cost-sharing was for practices having enduring benefits. All the funds were used.

#### Program Data

Participation Under the 1961 Agricultural Conservation Program			
Item	:	Unit	:Participating 1/
Farms.....	:	Number	: 1,216,556
Farmland.....	:	1,000 acres	: 433,372
Cropland.....	:	1,000 acres	: 182,225
Noncrop pasture & range:	:	1,000 acres	: 184,827

1/ Includes the United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Supplementary (Emergency) Agricultural Conservation Programs.



Agricultural Conservation Program Results, 1936-1961 - Totals for  
Selected Practice Accomplishments\* in 1961 and Accumulative  
Totals from 1936 to 1961

Practice	Unit	1961	Total 1936-1961
Standard terraces.....	Miles	33,470	1,413,034
	:1000 acres:	689	26,131
Spreader or diversion terraces.....	Miles	3,574	129,167
Sod waterways.....	:1000 acres:	44	726
Storage type dams and reservoirs.....	:1000		
	:structures:	50	1,705
Leveling irrigated land to control erosion and conserve water.....	:1000 acres:	341	7,498
Special tillage operations on cropland to control erosion.....	:1000 acres:	3,908	142,089
Stripcropping.....	:1000 acres:	467	111,055
Control of competitive shrubs on range or pastureland.....	:1000 acres:	2,209	44,377
Drainage of developed farmland.....	:1000 acres:	1,520	41,670
Tree planting.....	:1000 acres:	335	3,327
Timber stand improvement.....	:1000 acres:	256	2,598
Liming to make possible the establishment or improvement of protective cover.....	:1000 tons	16,746	439,549
Establishing or improving vegetative cover..	:1000 acres:	16,055	790,610

\*Includes data for applicable supplemental (emergency) practices.

Emergency Conservation Measures - 1961

Under the 1961 program, \$8,920,858 of emergency funds were used to share costs of special emergency conservation practices in disaster areas.

Kind of disaster:	No. of States:	No. of counties:	Emergency funds used:	States
Flood	7	46	Dollars : 1,358,364	Ark., Hawaii, Ky., Miss., Oreg., P. R., Texas
Drought	9	158	7,562,494	Ariz., Idaho, Mont., Nev., N.Dak., Oreg., S. Dak., Utah, Wyo.
	(net):			
Total	15	204	8,920,858:	XX

These funds were authorized under Public Law 85-58, 85-170, 85-766, and 87-332. Flood disasters required emergency conservation measures such as removal of debris and smoothing damaged farmland, deep plowing to turn under debris deposits, and the restoration of damaged drainage systems, stream



and irrigation channels, terraces, sod waterways, dikes, and levees. Drought necessitated wind erosion control, construction or deepening of ponds or wells for livestock water, etc. In addition, \$195,635 of regular ACP funds were used, in areas where available, to share costs on similar emergency conservation practices in these disaster areas.

#### Naval Stores Conservation Program

The 1961 Naval Stores Conservation Program was administered by the Forest Service as in previous years. Gross assistance of \$895,219 was provided on 3,171 turpentine farms in 7 States for practices to conserve the Nation's Naval Stores resources. The 7 States were Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina and Texas. 62 percent of all turpentine farms participated. The timber resources involved in the Naval Stores area amount to approximately 40 million acres.

#### ACP Accelerates Watershed Programs

The 1961 program brought a substantial upswing in the amount of ACP cost-sharing which county committees used to accelerate the land treatment measures in watersheds for which organized programs have been developed.

The Agricultural Conservation Program helps farmers attain the level of conservation treatment on their lands necessary to meet legislative prerequisites for the installation of small watershed program works of improvement. Then the ACP assistance helps farmers to undertake the remaining land treatment measures needed to complete the program. It helps farmers to continue the soil, water, woodland, and wildlife conservation practices necessary to protect and enhance the land after the watershed program has been installed.

The following data show the extent of 1961 ACP cost-sharing in various types of authorized and organized watersheds:

1961 Agricultural Conservation Program Data for Watershed Programs				
Type of Watershed	: Number of : watersheds on : which data : are included	: Watershed : farms : receiving ACP : cost-sharing	: 1961 ACP : cost-sharing : received by : these farms	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Dollars</u>	
Flood prevention.....	11	31,871	6,012,500	
Pilot.....	55	4,218	660,300	
Watershed protection and flood prevention:				
(a) Authorized for installation of works of improvement.....	368	26,901	5,177,800	
(b) Authorized for planning assistance.....	187	15,882	2,824,200	
Miscellaneous.....	325	16,614	3,311,200	
Total.....	946	95,486	17,986,000	

### THE 1962 PROGRAM

In 1962, the Department continued the policy of emphasizing enduring practices which are essential in the public interest and which farmers or ranchers do not carry out to the desired extent with their own resources. Practices needed to meet the conservation problems on land being shifted out of crop production were widely used. For the first time, ACP assistance was offered for conservation practices primarily to benefit wildlife, which also have soil or water conservation benefits.

The Agricultural Conservation Program has had a major effect on land-use adjustments. The program has shared with farmers the cost of establishing about 33 million acres of enduring vegetative cover, including tree cover, during the eight years 1954-1961. A high percentage of this land previously was producing crops at an intensive level.

A special project, related to rural areas development, was undertaken in 1962 by the ASC county and community committees. First, they identified farms and ranches that had not been doing conservation work in recent years. Usually these were operated by low income families with underused land and labor resources. Then the community committeemen tried to stimulate some of these families to undertake a significant conservation project that would help conserve soil or water resources and by better use of the land bring economic benefits to the family. Conservation practices have been carried out in 1962 on more than 150,000 such farms and ranches.

### Emergency Conservation Measures - 1962

Flood damage to farmlands and conservation structures was quite extensive during the 1962 program year. Also an ~~unusually severe~~ freeze in Alaska (Matanuska Valley) killed established stands of vegetative cover on land areas subject to serious wind erosion.

Allocations of 1962 ACP emergency funds, totaling \$3,158,000, were made to 13 States for use in 62 designated counties. The 13 States are: Alaska, Delaware, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming. These funds were from those authorized under Public Laws 85-58, 85-170, 85-766, and 87-332.

In the case of flood, the conservation practices are about the same as those previously stated with respect to the emergency conservation measures authorized under the 1961 Agricultural Conservation Program. In Alaska, the emergency measures were those necessary to reestablish the vegetative cover.

### THE PROGRAM FOR 1963

The 1963 program is essentially the same as the 1962 national program. It will be the first program operated under the authority provided in Section 101 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 for permanent Federal administration of the Agricultural Conservation Program.



Authority for local development and adaptation of the program continues. There is also encouragement for modifications of regular practices to meet local problems. Under this authority, emphasis is given to sound land-use adjustment, land treatment measures in special watershed programs, and special farm conservation problems of particular consequence in depressed agricultural areas.

USDA - January, 1963  
ASCS - Policy and Program  
Appraisal Division



The first of these is the fact that the  
 Government has not yet decided whether it  
 will accept the offer of the United States  
 to purchase the Alaska Pipeline. This  
 decision is of great importance to the  
 country, and it is hoped that it will be  
 made soon.

U. S. Department of Agriculture  
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

A C P --

A R E C O R D O F A C C O M P L I S H M E N T

ACP attacks poverty and strengthens the economy by --

- \* Improving poor land that makes people poor.
- \* Insuring future production capacity of good land.
- \* Stimulating business by developing a larger market for conservation goods and services, thus creating new job opportunities.
- \* Introducing and expanding new and improved conservation techniques.
- \* Helping shift land to more needed uses.
- \* Reducing costly flood and sediment damage.
- \* Helping overcome flood or drought disasters, restoring productive capacity to the land, with benefit to the farm family it supports.
- \* Assuring a more adequate supply of water for industrial growth.

Rural America today is better able to play an increasingly vital role in the Nation's war on poverty because of the Agricultural Conservation Program.

Through this program (ACP), about 2 million farmers and ranchers regularly are applying needed soil, water, woodland, and wildlife conservation programs on their land.

About two-thirds of all raw materials used by American industry and commerce are products of our agricultural lands. Land now used for crops must continue to produce more of the food and other agricultural products required for more and more people. The ACP investment in the public interest, then, helps insure the wise use and protection of privately owned farmlands, so vital to the health and well-being of all citizens, both now and in the future.

ACP attacks and corrects conditions which breed and foster poverty in both rural and urban America. A stronger farm is able to produce food, fiber, and timber at lower cost to consumers. It also furthers a higher standard of living, both locally and nationally.

The program is singularly effective in helping farmers stay out as well as get out of poverty.

## ACP Bridges the Gap

In the past 2 years, 300,000 farmers who had done little or no conservation work in recent years have started using conservation practices with the help of ACP. For some, this is the first step toward more efficient farming. It was accomplished through the encouragement and help of local farmer-committeemen who administer ACP in the field, acting on their own time and without pay.

It isn't enough to recognize the need for conservation and improvement of the soil, water, woodland, and wildlife resources of our farms. It takes money to stop erosion, to maintain fertility, and to restore organic matter. There may also be a loss of immediate income when a conservation system of farming is adopted.

And, on most farms, conservation cannot come first. If the family is in need, it cannot come at all. In such cases, it is hard to tell which is "cause" and which is "effect." Poor and unproductive land breeds poverty. And poverty causes farmers to "mine" the soil.

ACP cost-sharing assistance frequently spells the difference between willingness and ability to act -- between knowing about the advantages of conservation and actually applying it on the land.

This is not limited to individual farms. ACP cost-sharing initiates many conservation projects which involve from a few to many farms.

\* \* \*

In South Carolina, for instance, a group of farmers used ACP in attacking a conservation problem which affected 20 farms. The greatest single need in this Colleton County community was some means of managing the excess water on 75 percent of the cropland. Farmers were aware of the need. But many were dubious about undertaking an ACP "pooling agreement" to construct the needed ditches. No one had the money for his part on the project.

Then a small flood crystallized group opinion in favor of the project, and a cost-share formula was worked out, predicated on the amount of acreage each participant would have involved.

A technical survey showed that two outlet ditches were needed. The project was divided into two pooling agreements. The first, including 12 farms, required a drainage ditch approximately 2 miles long, requiring 11,000 cubic yards of earth removal. The second affected 8 farms and called for a drainage ditch 1.3 miles long, requiring 7,300 cubic yards of earth removal. The ditches affected an average of 41 acres for the 17 participants.



The problem of financing was solved when a local bank, two private lenders, the Production Credit Association, and the Farmers Home Administration learned what was involved and the benefits that would result.

All participants in the Colleton County pooling agreements agreed that the ditch projects -- which doubled the group's income from special crops and made food crop production more dependable -- would not have been possible without ACP.

#### ACP and Economic Growth

For over a quarter-century, ACP has been steadily fulfilling its basic function of helping conserve and build greater strength into the Nation's farmland. This has created new opportunity for improvement in rural areas. It has advanced the economic and social welfare of farm and city people alike.

By the very nature of its conservation work, a high proportion of the total ACP assistance is invested in the local economy through the purchase of materials, services, and equipment necessary in carrying out approved conservation practices. Among the businesses which benefit most are those that deal in seeds, agricultural minerals, miscellaneous farm and timber working supplies, farm equipment, petroleum products, earth-moving services, and credit.

Since farmers and ranchers contribute about equally with the public to the ACP practices performed, the total investment in conservation stimulated by ACP in 1963 alone approached a half-billion dollars. This was roughly half farmers' own money and half public funds in the form of cost-sharing.

\* \* \*

Two Iowa counties are putting a sounder base under their economy with ACP help by shifting land from uneconomic erosion-inducing corn production to pastures for a stronger livestock industry. What they are doing can be repeated in the Appalachian area and other places where both business and agriculture are having a hard time.

The Iowa counties are Appanoose and Monroe, where corn yields are below the break-even point and where much of the land is subject to serious erosion. The farm and business people of these counties decided to try to build up pastures and livestock herds. Businessmen helped finance an increase in good foundation livestock herds.

The ASC committees boosted the cost-sharing rates for pasture improvement in these counties to 80 percent, and the State Committee added funds to the regular amount available for this purpose.

In Appanoose County, about half the farms participated, and more would have if funds had been available. They seeded nearly 3,000 acres of cropland to pasture, improved 3,000 acres of pasture by establishing better varieties of grasses and legumes, and cleared brush from 1,000 acres. Agreements call for the converted cropland to remain in pasture at least 5 years, and the present owners agree not to take the improved pasture out of grass as long as they operate the land.

In Monroe County, the results were similar. More than 6,000 feeder calves were marketed from the county last fall, most of them to feeders in good grain-producing areas of the State.

\* \* \*

In Jefferson County, Wash., ACP conservation work has brought material benefits to a dairy farm, at the same time contributing to the economy of the whole area through the more stable agriculture the program helped establish.

When the operator took over the farm from his father, he faced four immediately apparent problems: (1) Excessively wet land, due to poor drainage on the lower levels; (2) poor pasture and hay land, with heavy weed infestation; (3) insufficient forage acreage to carry enough dairy cattle to make a living; and (4) a rapidly flowing stream from hill land nearby that was severely cutting into the two best fields on the farm.

The farmer gives major credit to ACP for making it possible for him to carry out the needed measures on his holdings.

Improvements on the 240-acre farm have included reseeding 80 acres to permanent grass; digging 6,300 lineal feet of open drainage ditches and laying 2,106 lineal feet of tile drainage for better water management; constructing 400 square yards of rock and log revetment to control erosion; and removing 1,000 cubic yards of earth in stream channel alignment for erosion control and improved drainage. The carrying capacity of the farmer's forage has increased from barely 40 head of cows to 60 head, plus 115 head of young cattle.

The dramatic conservation work on the farm through ACP has triggered similar efforts by neighboring farmers to do likewise, creating an ever-widening circle of protected and improved farms.

\* \* \*

Hubbard County, Minn., offers a good example of how farmers can use the ACP to make a major shift in land use to boost the local economy.

Cropland in the county is of relatively low productivity, and there is a recognized need to establish and reinforce timber stands. Yet few farm operators have the financial resources needed to remove acreage for a long period of years from usage providing an annual return for labor and capital.

In this particular ACP reforestation program, more than 150 land operators participated, shifting  $3\frac{1}{2}$  percent of the county's cropland to timber production. They planted nearly 3.9 million trees on more than 3,000 acres. The Minnesota Forest Service has estimated that, during the next 50 years, forest products worth \$302,000 at current prices will be harvested from this land, and that the stumpage remaining will be worth \$318,000. The newly forested land will also enhance the resort and other recreation attractions of the county.

Of immediate benefit, the planting of such a substantial acreage to trees contributed to the economy of Hubbard County, generating economic activity through the use of labor and materials in planting these trees. Of future benefit, the land will contribute substantially to meeting demands for timber and other forest products, and, as "producing" timberland on the tax rolls, it will provide needed revenues to local and State governments.

\* \* \*

Over a year's time, farmers using ACP assistance plant about a quarter-million acres of trees for forestry purposes, plus 30,000 to 50,000 acres for erosion-control windbreaks and wildlife purposes. These trees are needed for both their conservation values and their ultimate contributions to our economy. This tree-planting also removes much land from the actual or potential production of unneeded row crops and small grains.

In the planting process alone, the economy is helped. Around 60,000 man-days of work each year go into ACP tree-planting practices, and along with this is 30,000 days of work for tractors and tree-planting machines.

To date ACP has helped farmers plant about 4 million acres of trees. This is the equivalent of the wood needed to support at least a dozen average pulp-mills worth nearly a billion dollars, 30,000 jobs, and payments to employees and for wood totaling \$170 million each year.



### ACP Means More and Cleaner Water

ACP is a key part of such team efforts as organized watershed conservation, soil and water conservation district programs, and the Department of Agriculture's rural areas development (RAD) program.

In fact, ACP's benefits extend far beyond rural boundaries. Farm and city people alike are becoming more aware of how the water-conserving and erosion-control practices encouraged by ACP enhance their economy and their health, comfort, and safety.

The very cleanness of the water which we use and enjoy is a result of conservation farming. Downstream sediment is the largest single pollutant of the Nation's streams and reservoirs. All sediment results from erosion of one form or another, but conservation farming methods control it at its source.

Farmers who are cooperating through ACP in carrying out conservation practices to restrict runoff and erosion on farmland are therefore helping solve an urgent problem of town and city people.

Conservation practices, applied on the farms in local watersheds through ACP, catch and hold rain and snow, cause the water to soak into the soil instead of running off, add to ground water supplies, and release the water more regularly into streams and reservoirs. This results in good water supplies when needed rather than loss of the water in damaging floods. It also provides cover and clean water for wildlife, thus enhancing outdoor recreation.

Practices to prevent or control erosion include such measures as pasture, range, and woodland improvement; terracing and strip cropping; seeding grass or planting trees; and the erection of floodwater-retarding structures or floodwater diversions.

\* \* \*

In 8 counties in southern Indiana, for example, farmers who are working with locally governed soil and water conservation districts in protecting their lands against floods, erosion, and sediment damage have had much ACP help. Requirements for cover and erosion control on uplands above the watershed flood-prevention dams have been met promptly and even speeded up through ACP practices. Cleaner water on the farms and in the area's towns is one result of such cooperation.

ACP practices carried out in the area in one year alone included planting more than 500 acres of trees on land not suitable for cultivating row crops, putting more than 8,000 acres into permanent cover to hold the highly erodible soil, seeding legumes on another 4,000 acres to help keep the land tied down between crops, building 161 water-storage dams to help manage water and prevent seasonal floods on farm fields. Altogether, owners and operators of more than 3,600 farms used ACP to conserve soil, water, timber, and wildlife in the 8-county area.

Some cropland is being converted to other uses with program aid, and farmers are selling recreation to supplement their incomes. Livestock water ponds built with ACP assistance have opened up grazing on adjoining lands (instead of surplus crop production) and provided picnicking and fishing areas as recreation bonuses. Other farmers are creating new lakes or developing existing ones on their farms especially for fishing, picnicking, and other activities.

\* \* \*

By maintaining the productive capacity and availability for use of our land and water resources, ACP helps hold down the cost of food, clothing, electricity, water bills, and even manufactured products. It also reduces the direct costs of removing silt from streams, reservoirs, harbors, and roadway ditches, and promotes better recreational opportunities and better health prospects for everyone.

#### How Developed and Administered

ACP and its accomplishments are reviewed annually in the light of changing conditions, and recommendations are made to improve the program. The Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the Farmers Home Administration, soil and water conservation district governing bodies, and many other agencies and organizations take part in this process in the counties and States.

Emphasis is given to sound land-use adjustment, land-treatment measures in special watershed programs, and special farm-conservation problems of particular consequence in depressed agriculture areas. Conservation practices must meet definite specifications, based on technical standards.

#### Program Operations and Accomplishments

The 1963 program was operated, as directed by the Congress, at a level of \$250 million, including administration. ACP assistance made available for farmers amounted to \$220 million. Also, in disaster areas designated as provided in Public Law 85-58 -- in 64 counties of 10 States -- about \$5 million of special funds were provided to share costs with farmers for emergency conservation measures required due to floods, windstorms, drought, or earthquake.

The 1963 ACP for each State, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands emphasized the conservation measures required to meet the conservation needs of the area, especially those practices which provide the most enduring benefits practicably attainable.

In solving conservation problems, farmers received ACP cost-sharing assistance for such practices as:

- \* Establishing long-lasting protective cover of grasses, legumes, and trees to hold soil, save water, and get sounder land use.
- \* Improving or sustaining protective cover to keep the land in cover and get more effective soil and water conservation.
- \* Conserving or safely disposing of water, primarily by installing earth-moving or construction measures.
- \* Installing soil- and water-conserving practices primarily to benefit wildlife.
- \* Establishing protective vegetative cover to enhance conservation by controlling erosion between crops.
- \* Applying emergency vegetative and mechanical measures to protect soil from wind and water erosion.

Conservation practices having long-term benefits accounted for close to 90 percent of ACP's cost-sharing. About 1.2 million farms participated. About 2 million farms -- including 700 million acres, or more than half the Nation's total farmland -- have participated one or more times in the last 3 years.

Major program accomplishments under the ACP reported in fiscal year 1963 include:

- 49,000 ponds constructed to distribute grazing, permit grassland farming, control erosion and fire, heal gullying, conserve irrigation and other surface water, and benefit wildlife.
- 694,000 acres of terraces constructed to control erosion or to detain, control, or conserve water.
- 369,000 acres of stripcropping systems established to control wind or water erosion and conserve water.
- 42,000 acres of permanent sod waterways established to control erosion and sedimentation, heal gullies, and safely dispose of excess runoff.
- 3.9 million acres of long-term vegetative cover established to control erosion, reduce sedimentation of streams and reservoirs, improve soil structure, conserve water, and for adjustment to better land uses.
- 2 million acres of undesirable shrubs controlled on range or pasture to permit growth of desirable cover for erosion control and to save moisture.
- 25,000 farms where irrigated land practices were improved to save water and control erosion and 60,000 farms where drainage practices were carried out, both practices for better water supply, control, and management on land already in use for crops and pasture.
- 283,000 acres of trees and shrubs planted for forestry purposes, erosion control, watershed stabilization, land-use adjustment, or wildlife benefits.
- 213,000 acres of forest tree stands improved for forestry purposes, erosion control, and watershed management.